

Correctional Med. Services, Inc., 287 F. App'x 142, 144 (3d Cir. 2008) (citing *Goff v. Harper*, 60 F.3d 518, 520 (8th Cir. 1995)).

Connections argues that Plaintiff has failed to meet the requisites for injunctive relief. Connections refers to the fact that Plaintiff received continuing medical treatment for his conditions and that he also received physical therapy. It argues that because Plaintiff receives treatment, he has not shown a probability of success on the merits. Dr. DuShuttle notes that the instant motion does not seek action from him, and adopts Connections' position.

Given Plaintiff's release from prison, his motion is moot. In addition, upon review of Plaintiff's motion, as well as the evidence of record, the Court concludes that Plaintiff has not demonstrated the likelihood of success on the merits. Notably, Plaintiff indicates that, while incarcerated, he received continuing medical treatment, albeit not to his liking, and this weighs against a finding of deliberate indifference. See *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 103-05 (1976) (an inmate must allege (i) a serious medical need and (ii) acts or omissions by prison officials that indicate deliberate indifference to that need).

Therefore, the court **DENIES** the motion. (D.I. 29).


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE